

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being unpatentable over Yu. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Yu discloses a method of supplying information over the internet. The method includes assigning tags to documents and storing documents and tags in a database. The tags are used to search for the documents in the database. Documents are delivered over the internet to clients.

Yu fails to teach Applicants' claimed subject matter. Yu fails to disclose a kiosk for displaying web pages and printing information from the web page using a receipt printer in a format determined from the address of the web page. Yu fails to disclose a kiosk with the claimed functionality or a receipt printer.

Yu is directed to solving a different problem. Further, Yu teaches away from a user selecting a web page and printing information in the web page. Instead, Yu teaches that it would be better for the user to obtain web content from the disclosed database.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being unpatentable over Ranmachandran. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Ranmachandran discloses an automated teller machine having added functionality, including dispensing of digital content and photo quality prints. Ranmachandran prescribes a printing system 64 capable of output documents and/or photo quality prints.

Ranmachandran fails to teach Applicants' claimed subject matter. Ranmachandran fails to disclose printing information from the web page using a receipt printer in a format determined from the address of the web page. Ranmachandran fails to disclose printing to a receipt printer of the ATM. Ranmachandran has avoided Applicants' problem of printing to a receipt printer incapable of printing such documents without special formatting.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e)/103(a) as being anticipated/unpatentable over Chang. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Chang discloses a method of printing to any printer, despite the fact that not all printers operate in the same

way, e.g., some printers are postscript printers with internal print processing, and some are PCL printers without internal print processing. Thus, a document requires conversion to the printing language of the printer that is chosen to print the document. This conversion may be performed by software in a computer, or a combination of hardware or software in a printer.

Chang further teaches that the user may be provide with printing options, such as page layout, numbers of copies, color/grayscale, print quality parameters. These options are typically called printer setup options and are associated with the printer driver. Therefore, no additional formatting is required in order to print.

Finally, Chang recognizes that printing may not be possible to due a lack of compatibility.

Chang fails to teach Applicants' claimed subject matter. Chang is directed to solving a different problem, namely establishing communication between a computer and any printer to attempt printing. Chang fails to disclose a kiosk for displaying web pages and printing information from the web page using a receipt printer in a format determined from

the address of the web page. Chang fails to disclose a kiosk with the claimed functionality or a receipt printer.

In summary, there is no teaching or suggestion in any of the cited references directed to formatting information in a web page selected by a user based upon the address of the web page so that the information may be printed on receipt paper at a kiosk.

Applicants now respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Martin
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 34870
(937) 445-2990

Dayton, OH

JUL 14 2006